

### REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1, 17, 33, 37, and 41 are amended. Claims 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 are canceled without prejudice in order to reduce the number of issues for consideration. Claims 1-5, 13-25, 27-33, and 35-41 are pending in this application.

### 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 3-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,838,313 to Hou et al. (hereinafter "Hou") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,081,829 to Sidana (hereinafter "Sidana"). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 3-5 are allowable over Hou in view of Sidana.

Hou discloses a multimedia-based reporting system that allows drawing, text, and audio recording annotations to be added to the report (see, col. 2, lines 40-61, and col. 6, lines 52-66). The reporting system of Hou includes an annotation input interpreter that provides an interface between the user annotation input and three types of annotation handlers that can add annotations to a "canvas" of the report: a static annotation handler, a dynamic annotation handler, and an annotation on annotation handler (see, Fig. 9, and col. 6, lines 25-29).

Sidana is directed to general purpose web annotations without modifying the browser. In Sidana, a "redirector" is situated between a client browser and a server including a web document (see, Fig. 1). The

redirector stores the user's annotations to the web document, so the next time the user's client browser requests the web document, the request is routed through the redirector which adds the user's previous annotations to create an augmented web document that is displayed to the user. See, col. 4, lines 57-67, and col. 1, line 55 – col. 2, line 32.

In contrast, amended claim 1 recites in part:

an annotation server, coupled to the client computer,  
to,  
    maintain an annotation database having a plurality of annotations corresponding to the multimedia content,  
    provide the plurality of annotations to the client computer for playback,  
    send electronic mail messages including annotations to recipients identified by the client computer,  
    analyze electronic mail messages that are received not in reply to a previous electronic mail message that included annotation data, to locate data in the electronic mail messages,  
    generate new annotations that include the located data but no new annotation data, and  
    add the new annotations to the annotation database.

Hou is cited as teaching "generate new annotation that include display located content data in the electronic mail message (e.g., based on existent annotation data displayed col 6/lines 21-40)" and "add the new annotations (attached media types (26) col 6/lines 10-25, add dynamic annotations (39), e.g. voice, col 6/lines 26-37) and save in annotation database (col 4/lines 21-25, save report col 2/lines 50-51, report includes multimedia as well as attachments, col 1/lines 39-44, add the new

E

annotations, col 9/lines 15-32)" (see, September 11 Office Action at ¶ 3, p. 2).

Applicant respectfully submits, however, that Hou does not disclose or suggest to analyze electronic mail messages, generate new annotations, and add the new annotation to an annotation database as recited in amended claim 1.

Hou discloses an annotation on annotation handler that allows a user to select a desired segment of an annotation and make a new annotation which is a reply to this selected segment (see, col. 9, lines 14-24). However, this annotation on annotation handler of Hou allows a new annotation to be made that is a reply to a selected segment. Thus, the new annotations made using the annotation on annotation handler of Hou do not satisfy the "analyze electronic mail messages that are received not in reply to a previous electronic mail message" language of amended claim 1 because the new annotations made using the annotation on annotation handler of Hou are a reply. ?

1/37-44  
2/24-30  
3/18-18

Furthermore, the new annotations made using the annotation on annotation handler of Hou do not satisfy the "generate new annotations that include the located data but no new annotation data" language of amended claim 1 because the new annotations made using the annotation on annotation handler of Hou do include new annotation data.

Hou also discloses that, as illustrated in Figure 9 of Hou, annotations are created in Hou by way of user annotation input 36 that is provided to an annotation input interpreter, which forwards the input to either static

annotation handler 37, annotation on annotation handler 38, or dynamic annotation handler 39. These three handlers 37, 38, and 39 allow for the addition of different annotation inputs (e.g., drawings, text, or voice) to the report 32 (see also, col. 6, lines 26-37). After all annotations have been generated and added to report 32 by the interpreter 24 and handlers 37, 38, and 39, mail report handler can generate an e-mail message for delivery (see also, col. 6, lines 14-16, and col. 4, lines 25-31).

Thus, Hou discloses generating annotations and adding them to a report, and then generating an email message including the report. In other words, Hou discloses generating the annotations and then generating the email message, whereas in amended claim 1 the electronic mail messages are analyzed and the new annotations generated based on the located data in the electronic mail messages. As the annotations in Hou are generated prior to generating the email message of Hou, Applicant respectfully submits that Hou cannot disclose or suggest generating new annotations that include located data from analyzing electronic mail messages (the email message is generated after the annotation in Hou, so there is no message to analyze in Hou).

Sidana is not cited as curing these deficiencies of Hou, and Applicant respectfully submits that Sidana does not cure these deficiencies of Hou.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is allowable over Hou in view of Sidana.

With respect to claims 3-5, given that claims 3-5 depend from amended claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3-5 are likewise allowable over Hou in view of Sidana for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claims 31-32, 37-39, 2, 6, and 8-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Hou in view of Sidana and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,009,462 to Birrell et al. (hereinafter "Birrell"). It appears from the Office Action that claims 17-25, 27-30, 33, 35, 36, and 40-42 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Hou in view of Sidana and in further view of Birrell. Claims 6 and 8-12 has been canceled without prejudice, thereby rendering the rejection of claims 6 and 8-12 moot. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 31-32, 37-39, 2, 17-25, 27-30, 33, 35, 36, and 40-42 are allowable over Hou in view of Sidana and in further view of Birrell.

With respect to claims 2 and 42, claims 2 and 42 depend from amended claim 1. Birrell is not cited as curing the deficiencies of Hou and Sidana as discussed above with respect to amended claim 1, and Applicant respectfully submits that Birrell does not cure these deficiencies of Hou and Sidana. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 and 42 are allowable over Hou in view of Sidana and in further view of Birrell for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to amended claim 1.

With respect to amended claim 17, amended claim 17 is directed to a method comprising:

receiving an electronic mail notification of a new annotation corresponding to media content, the new annotation corresponding

E

to one of a plurality of temporal segments of the media content that is after the beginning of the media content;  
presenting the electronic mail notification to a user;  
receiving a user selection of an identifier, within the electronic mail notification, of the media content; and  
accessing, in response to the user selection, a media server to stream, for rendering to the user, the media content beginning with the one of the plurality of temporal segments that corresponds to the new annotation.

It appears that Sidana is being relied on as teaching accessing, in response to the user selection, a media server to stream, for rendering to the user, the media content beginning with the one of the plurality of temporal segments that corresponds to the new annotation as recited in amended claim 17 (see, September 11 Office Action at ¶ 4, p. 7). Applicant respectfully submits that Sidana does not disclose or suggest the accessing of amended claim 17.

As discussed above, Sidana discloses a redirector that stores a user's annotations to a web document, so the next time the user's client browser requests the web document, the request is routed through the redirector which adds the user's previous annotations to create an augmented web document that is displayed to the user. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that there is no plurality of temporal segments of media content disclosed in Sidana. As there are no temporal segments, Applicant respectfully submits that it is not possible for Sidana to disclose or suggest the accessing of content beginning with a particular temporal segment as recited in amended claim 17.

Hou and Birrell are not cited as curing these deficiencies of Sidana, and Applicant respectfully submits that Hou and Birrell do not cure these deficiencies of Sidana.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 17 is allowable over Hou in view of Sidana and in further view of Birrell.

With respect to claims 18-22, given that claims 18-22 depend from amended claim 17, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 18-22 are likewise allowable over Hou in view of Sidana and in further view of Birrell for at least the reasons discussed above.

With respect to claim 23, Applicant respectfully submits that, analogous to the discussion above regarding amended claim 17, Sidana does not disclose or suggest automatically accessing, in response to the user selection of the identifier of the media content, a media server indicated by the identifier to begin, at a point in the media content after the beginning of the media content and corresponding to the new annotation, streaming the media content for presentation to the user as recited in claim 23. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 23 is allowable over Hou in view of Sidana and in further view of Birrell.

With respect to claim 24, given that claim 24 depends from claim 23, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 24 is likewise allowable over Hou in view of Sidana and in further view of Birrell for at least the reasons discussed above.

With respect to claim 25, Applicant respectfully submits that, analogous to the discussion above regarding amended claim 17, Sidana does not disclose or suggest a user-selectable link to the media content, wherein the link includes an identifier of the media content to which the new annotation corresponds, and an identifier of a temporal range of the media content that the new annotation content is associated with, wherein the temporal range corresponds to a location of the media content that is after the beginning of the media content and at which rendering of the media content should begin in response to selection of the link in the electronic mail message as recited in claim 25. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 25 is allowable over Hou in view of Sidana and in further view of Birrell.

With respect to claims 27-30, given that claims 27-30 depend from claim 25, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 27-30 are likewise allowable over Hou in view of Sidana and in further view of Birrell for at least the reasons discussed above.

With respect to claim 31, claim 31 is directed to a method comprising:

- receiving an electronic mail notification of an annotation corresponding to media content;

- replying to the electronic mail notification to generate a new annotation corresponding to the media content;

- including, in the reply, an identifier of one or more annotation sets of a plurality of annotation sets that the new annotation is associated with, wherein the annotation sets correspond to categories for annotations; and

- displaying a default recipient, corresponding to the identified one or more annotation sets, that is to receive an electronic mail notification of the new annotation.

7



It appears that the event data of Hou is being relied on as teaching the annotation sets as recited in claim 31 (see, September 11 Office Action at ¶ 4, p. 4). Applicant respectfully submits that Hou does not disclose or suggest the annotation sets as recited in claim 31.

In claim 31, a default recipient that is to receive an electronic mail notification of a new annotation corresponds to an identified one or more annotation sets. Applicant respectfully submits that no such default recipient exists in Hou. Using the language of Hou, if the event data of Hou were to be the annotation sets, then Hou would need to disclose a default recipient that is to receive an electronic mail notification of a new annotation that corresponds to an identified one or more event data. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no disclosure or suggestion of the event data of Hou corresponding to a default recipient, so the event data cannot disclose or suggest the annotation sets of claim 31.

Sidana and Birrell are not cited as curing these deficiencies of Hou, and Applicant respectfully submits that Sidana and Birrell do not cure these deficiencies of Hou.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 31 is allowable over Hou in view of Sidana and in further view of Birrell.

With respect to claim 32, given that claim 32 depends from claim 31, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 32 is likewise allowable over Hou in view of Sidana and in further view of Birrell for at least the reasons discussed above.

With respect to amended claim 33, amended claim 33 is directed to a method comprising:

receiving an electronic mail thread including a plurality of electronic mail messages;

creating, after the plurality of electronic mail messages have been included in the electronic mail thread, a plurality of annotations from the plurality of electronic mail messages in the electronic mail thread; and

adding the plurality of annotations to an annotation database.

Applicant respectfully submits that Hou in view of Sidana and in further view of Birrell does not disclose or suggest creating, after the plurality of electronic mail messages have been included in the electronic mail thread, a plurality of annotations from the plurality of electronic mail messages in the electronic mail thread as recited in amended claim 33.

Hou is cited as teaching "creating a plurality of annotation from at least one of the electronic mail messages in the electronic mail thread (Hou: generating an electronic mail message including both the content of the new annotation and an identifier of the media content, create electronic mail messages col 3/lines 8-13, create means: col 2/lines 25-37, col 3/lines 9-13)" and "adding a plurality of annotation to an annotation database (Hou: add the new annotations, col 9/lines 15-32, col 1/lines 17-20, adding annotations means: col 5/lines 29-52, report: col 6/lines 10-14, Fig. 3, saving in annotation database)".

As discussed above, Hou discloses generating an annotation prior to generating an email message, or an annotation on annotation handler that allows a new annotation to be made that is a reply to a selected segment.

However, nowhere does Hou disclose or suggest creating multiple annotations from an electronic mail thread, much less of creating the multiple annotations after the plurality of electronic mail messages have been included in the electronic mail thread.

The generating of an annotation prior to generating an email message of Hou cannot disclose or suggest the creating multiple annotations from an electronic mail thread of amended claim 33 because the annotation is generated prior to generating of the email message, not after the email message is generated. Additionally, the annotation on annotation handler cannot disclose or suggest the creating multiple annotations from an electronic mail thread of amended claim 33 because the annotation on annotation handler does not create multiple annotations from the plurality of electronic mail messages in the electronic mail thread after the plurality of electronic mail messages have been included in the electronic mail thread.

Sidana and Birrell are not cited as curing these deficiencies of Hou, and Applicant respectfully submits that Sidana and Birrell do not cure these deficiencies of Hou.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 33 is allowable over Hou in view of Sidana and in further view of Birrell.

With respect to claim 35, claim 35 depends from amended claim 33 and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 35 is allowable over Hou in view of Sidana and in further view of Birrell for at least the reasons

discussed above with respect to amended claim 33. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Hou in view of Sidana and in further view of Birrell does not disclose or suggest generating, for each of the plurality of electronic mail messages, an annotation as recited in claim 35.

As discussed above, Hou discloses generating an annotation prior to generating an email message, or an annotation on annotation handler that allows a new annotation to be made that is a reply to a selected segment. However, these annotations of Hou do not disclose or suggest generating, for each of the plurality of electronic mail messages, an annotation after the plurality of electronic mail messages have been included in the electronic mail thread as recited in claim 35.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 35 is allowable over Hou in view of Sidana and in further view of Birrell.

With respect to claim 36, given that claim 36 depends from amended claim 33, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 36 is likewise allowable over Hou in view of Sidana and in further view of Birrell for at least the reasons discussed above.

With respect to amended claim 37, Applicant respectfully submits that, analogous to the discussion above regarding amended claim 1, Hou does not disclose or suggest receiving an electronic mail message that is not in reply to a previous electronic mail message; locating data in the received electronic mail message; generating a new annotation from the located data in the electronic mail message, wherein the new annotation includes the located data but no new annotation data; and adding the new annotation to

an annotation store as recited in amended claim 37. Sidana and Birrell are not cited as curing these deficiencies of Hou, and Applicant respectfully submits that Sidana and Birrell do not cure these deficiencies of Hou. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 37 is allowable over Hou in view of Sidana and in further view of Birrell.

With respect to claims 38-39, given that claims 38-39 depend from amended claim 37, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 38-39 are likewise allowable over Hou in view of Sidana and in further view of Birrell for at least the reasons discussed above.

With respect to amended claim 41, Applicant respectfully submits that, analogous to the discussion above regarding amended claim 1, Hou does not disclose or suggest receiving an electronic mail message including data corresponding to media content that is not included in the electronic mail message; locating the data in the electronic mail message; generating, after locating the data, a new annotation corresponding to the media content, wherein the new annotation includes a content field including the located data but no new annotation data as recited in amended claim 41. Sidana and Birrell are not cited as curing these deficiencies of Hou, and Applicant respectfully submits that Sidana and Birrell do not cure these deficiencies of Hou. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 41 is allowable over Hou in view of Sidana and in further view of Birrell.

Claims 13-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Hou in view of Sidana and Birrell and in further view of

U.S. Patent No. 5,526,407 to Russell et al. (hereinafter "Russell"). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 13-16 are allowable over Hou in view of Sidana and Birrell and in further view of Russell.

In the September 11 Office Action, it was asserted that Russell discloses an "installation option that identifies an installation program that can be used to install one module allowing the content and corresponding media content to be rendered (col 16/lines 47-col 19/line 35)" (see, ¶5, p. 11). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The cited portion of Russell discloses sub-programs variously executed by the application system or the operating system within the personal computer (see, for example, col. 16, lines 47-49). The cited portion of Russell further discloses that a group of the sub-programs consists of a Dynamic Linked Library (DLL) and executable application subprograms (see, col. 16, lines 63-67).

In contrast, claim 13 recites in part:

generating an electronic mail message including,

...

an installation option that identifies an installation program that can be used to install one or more modules allowing the content and corresponding media content to be rendered;

Applicant respectfully submits that Russell does not disclose generating an electronic mail message that includes an installation option as recited in claim 13.

Applicant respectfully submits that nowhere does Russell disclose or suggest including an installation option in an electronic mail message as

recited in claim 13. Furthermore, none of Hou, Sidana, or Bissell is cited as disclosing, nor do they disclose or suggest, including an installation option in an electronic mail message as recited in claim 13.

In the September 11 Office Action, it was asserted that "It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporated extendable or optional functionality allowing the content media type/format to be displayed (rendered), as taught by Russell" (see, ¶5, p. 11).

Applicant respectfully submits that, even if it were obvious to combine Russell with Hou, Sidana, and Bissell, there is still no disclosure or suggestion in the combination of including an installation option in an electronic mail message as recited in claim 13. Applicant respectfully submits that merely having an application installed on a personal computer does not disclose or suggest including an installation option in an electronic mail message as recited in claim 13.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 is allowable over Hou in view of Sidana and Birrell and in further view of Russell.

Given that claims 14-16 depend from claim 13, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 14-16 are allowable over Hou in view of Sidana and Birrell and in further view of Russell for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 13.

With respect to claim 40, it was asserted in the September 11 Office Action that "Regarding claims 40, link to installation program (Birrel: col

12/lines 35-44)" (see, ¶ 4, p. 10). Claim 40 depends from claim 13, and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 40 is allowable over Hou in view of Sidana and Birrell and in further view of Russell for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 13.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Birrell does not disclose or suggest generating an electronic mail message including a user-selectable link that identifies an installation program that can be used to install one or more modules allowing the content and corresponding media content to be rendered as claimed in claim 40.

Applicant notes that the cited portion of Birrell is included in a section titled "Embedded Links" (see, col. 12, line 15). The system of Birrell, when displaying messages, locates text strings which have the syntax of e-mail addresses, and if the user clicks on one of these addresses then the system will display a window so that the user can easily generate a reply message to the selected e-mail address(es) (see, col. 12, lines 16-21). The system of Birrell, when displaying messages, also locates text strings that have the syntax of an URL and makes the string a hot-link – when the user clicks on the hot-link the URL is passed to the browser which will retrieve the contents over the network and process the contents in the normal manner (see, col. 12, lines 22 – 27).

However, Applicant respectfully submits that displaying e-mail addresses that the user can click on or hot-links to contents retrieved over a network does not disclose or suggest a user-selectable link that identifies an installation program that can be used to install one or more modules



allowing the content and corresponding media content to be rendered as claimed in claim 40. Nothing in generating a reply message or selecting a hot-link discloses or suggests a user-selectable link that identifies an installation program as claimed in claim 40.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 40 is allowable over Hou in view of Sidana and Birrell and in further view of Russell.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejections be withdrawn.


### **Conclusion**

Claims 1-5, 13-25, 27-33, and 35-41 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: March 11, 2003

By:

  
Allan T. Sponseller  
Reg. No. 38,318  
(509) 324-9256

**Version of Claims with Markings to Show Changes Made**

1. (Three Times Amended) A system comprising:

a client computer to playback multimedia content and annotations corresponding to different temporal portions of the multimedia content; and

an annotation server, coupled to the client computer, to,

maintain an annotation database having a plurality of annotations corresponding to the multimedia content,

provide the plurality of annotations to the client computer for playback,

send electronic mail messages including annotations to recipients identified by the client computer,

analyze electronic mail messages that are received not in reply to a previous electronic mail message that included annotation data, to locate data in the electronic mail messages,

generate new annotations that include the located data but no new annotation data, and

add the new annotations to the annotation database.

17. (Three Times Amended) A method comprising:

receiving an electronic mail notification of a new annotation corresponding to media content, the new annotation corresponding to one of a plurality of temporal segments of the media content that is after the beginning of the media content;

presenting the electronic mail notification to a user;  
receiving a user selection of an identifier, within the electronic mail notification, of the media content; and  
accessing, in response to the user selection, a media server to stream, for rendering to the user, the media content beginning with the one of the plurality of temporal segments that corresponds to the new annotation.

33. (Twice Amended) A method comprising:  
receiving an electronic mail thread including a plurality of electronic mail messages;  
creating, after the plurality of electronic mail messages have been included in the electronic mail thread, a plurality of annotations from the plurality of electronic mail messages in the electronic mail thread; and  
adding the plurality of annotations to an annotation database.

37. (Three Times Amended) One or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a computer program that, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform functions including:  
receiving an electronic mail message that is not in reply to a previous electronic mail message;  
locating data in the received electronic mail message;

E

generating a new annotation from the located data in the electronic mail message, wherein the new annotation includes the located data but no new annotation data; and

adding the new annotation to an annotation store.

41. (Amended) A method comprising:

receiving an electronic mail message including data corresponding to media content that is not included in the electronic mail message;

locating the data in the electronic mail message;

generating, after locating the data, a new annotation corresponding to the media content, wherein the new annotation includes,

an author field including data identifying a sender of the electronic mail message as an author of the new annotation,

a creation time field including data identifying the time at which the new annotation is generated,

a title field including data identifying a title of the new annotation,

a content field including the located data but no new annotation data, and

a media content identifier field including data identifying the media content to which the new annotation corresponds.